

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/796,093	03/10/2004	Kazutaka Nagashima	248666US0DIV	2332
22850	7590 10/14/2004		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			ZUCKER, PAUL A	
	SIREEI RIA, VA 22314	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	·		1621	

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/796,093	NAGASHIMA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Paul A. Zucker	1621				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status		•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•					
	action is non-final.					
· ·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 49 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 49 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	- · · · · ·	• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/117,196.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)	о <b>П</b>					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)         Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/10/2004.     </li> </ol>	4)  Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5)  Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	e				

Application/Control Number: 10/796,093

Art Unit: 1621

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng et al (US 2002/0065309-A1 05-2002). Peng discloses (paragraphs [0012]-[0026])
   compounds of formula (I) as GnRH antagonists:

Application/Control Number: 10/796,093 Page 3

Art Unit: 1621

Peng exemplifies (paragraph [0172]) the synthesis of a compound of formula (I) employing the aldehyde 3-hydroxy-4-methoxyphenylacetaldehyde:

which corresponds to lower adjacent homologue of the instantly claimed compound lacking a single methylene in the aldehyde chain.

The difference between the compound exemplified by Peng and that instantly claimed is that the instantly claimed compound is an adjacent higher homologue of that exemplified by Peng.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the instantly claimed compound by the expectation that the adjacent homolog of the compound of formula (I) produced therefrom would have similar properties to the compound exemplified by Peng. This expectation would have been reinforced by Peng's teaching (Paragraph [00057]) that L<sub>3</sub>, corresponding to the chain connecting the phenyl and aldehyde groups, can be a chain of 1-24 carbon atoms. There would, therefore, also have been a reasonable expectation of success.

Thus the instantly claimed compound would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

## **Conclusion**

2. Claim 29 is pending. Claim 29 is rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul A. Zucker whose telephone number is 571-272-0650. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann R. Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul A. Zucker, Ph. D.

**Patent Examiner** 

Technology Center 1600